

## Appendix A

Application No. 16/01902/OUT – Land North of New Yatt Road, North Leigh

Mr Robson indicated that he did not intend to seek approval of the application but to request deferral of its consideration. In determining an application, it was necessary to consider the balance between positive and negative impacts of the proposed development.

Mr Robson noted that nine consultation responses remained outstanding and indicated that, should the application be refused, the applicants might have to submit an appeal. If the application was deferred the applicants would have the opportunity to provide more information in relation to concerns expressed with regard to archaeology, ecology and transport, all of which they considered could be adequately addressed.

If these issues were resolved, an appeal could focus upon the principle of development alone and could be dealt with through an informal hearing rather than a more complex, time consuming and expensive public enquiry.

In conclusion, Mr Robson stated that he believed that the outstanding issues regarding archaeology, ecology and transport could be addressed within four to six weeks, leaving the application to be determined on the basis of the principle of development alone.

**WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE 15<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2016**

**16/02102/FUL – STONELEA FARM, BRIZE NORTON, CARTERTON, OXON, OX18 3PA**

This application is made by a young, ambitious, hard working and enthusiastic farmer with a young family.

The applicant is an exceptional stockman, who has created, with hard work, significant investment and development a successful and growing farming business, centred around breeding pigs and rearing beef calves.

We have been involved with pre-application discussions for almost two years and the application before you has satisfied all elements of relevant planning policy and the consultees, and was recommended for approval subject to a response from OCC Minerals Team.

Extensive discussions with OCC and the Planning Officer have taken place as there is concern that the proposed dwelling, in its current position could potentially affect the provision of a new quarry in nearby land. Land which was previously nominated by the former owner. Change of ownership means land is no longer nominated.

To put it into context, a 100m sterilisation zone around the proposed dwelling in its current position would only sterilise 25m of the nearby land, which is presumably still nominated, so that less than half of one percent of the land nominated would be affected, if the quarry was ever to occur, decades in the future.

We feel it is so fundamentally paramount for the applicant and his livestock, for him to live within sight and sound of the buildings, and the hypothetical impact so negligible, that it is worthy of your consideration today.

The nearby land was proposed a decade ago as a potential site for Crushed Rock extraction within the April 2007 Consultation Paper, and in all likelihood, any quarrying here would not occur for many decades and would have to be brought forward by the landowner at the time to seek approval through planning in order to go ahead. A change in land ownership could result in the site never being brought forward anyway.

We do not dispute the importance of having sufficient stone provision within the county, however we are discussing a potential impact upon an entirely hypothetical situation, based on policies that aren't even adopted, that would only happen a long way in the future, and we all agree that the impact is minute.

More important are the needs of the applicant, his stock, and his farming business, that has proved itself through two years of pre-app and has satisfied all relevant areas of current planning policy.

Your understanding and support for local agriculture in such a genuine case is required here today, and I urge you to consider this applicant favourably.

Councillors,

I come here today to speak on behalf a large group of objectors who believe their voice has not been heard and who's views may otherwise be unrepresented.

We are here to refute the approval made by the planning officer.

A previous plan for the same plot of land was withdrawn, prior to decision, citing privacy and lack of context as reasons for possible refusal. However we do not believe these or a number of other issues have been dealt with or answered. Over 50 objections have been submitted to the planning office comprising; building on a conservation area and detracting from Grade 2 listed buildings, poor access to the currently existing cul-de-sac and proposed housing, lack of privacy and road safety among many others.

I will now discuss the main concerns in detail to hopefully convince you that this is not only an emotive subject but a factual one.

Firstly is a matter for the nearest properties and the overlooking they will suffer. The proposed three dwellings will sit in a solid row, blocking views into and out of the West End. Those who reside in the West End will literally have terraced houses built in their back gardens and on a higher elevation. How can this not be considered a imposition on their privacy? Farmers Close will become entirely surrounded by development in what is already a hectic estate of close terraced housing.

Now to the issue of traffic safety. The developers approached the council previously regarding this matter (Appendix 2) and were informed it wasn't viable given pedestrian visibility and single car access. Despite this the Highways Agency has deemed it suitable with an almost identical access to be forged from Bakers Piece. However, the same issues remain. There are no pavements in the street for pedestrian safety, the proposed access will only support one vehicle (although there are no detailed measurements given), the proposed access will also be a blind corner given the shape of the existing parking (hence no pedestrian visibility), access to Bakers Piece cannot support service vehicles (as shown from our photographic evidence). How will the new houses have their waste collected, fire trucks and ambulances attend incidents?

Lastly is the matter of the conservation area, wall which surrounds the plot and lack of context. As can be seen from our large volume of objections, if it were simply a matter of opinion, we would 'win'. There have been no supporting submissions regarding this site. The entire concept of the conservation area would be blown out of the water should this proposal go ahead and set precedence for other inappropriate developments, encroaching ever more into these historic areas. It is not in keeping with the existing design; building 70s style houses in the twenty first century on the land of eighteenth century houses which are specifically noted in many council and historic publications. These houses and burgage plots literally shape the town, they are the original houses, the wall has been noted to be the historic town wall and precious to our heritage.

I implore you, please do not allow this development to go ahead. It will change the very nature of our neighbourhood who have rallied together in a time of need. Due to the poor communication (lack of signage in Farmers Close and the West End, no updates regarding the amended block plan, incorrect dates on the website etc) it has been down to us, the residents who will live with the consequences, to delve deeper and question the legitimacy of the proposal.

Once again I remind the Councillors we object due to unsafe road conditions, invasion of privacy/ overbearing and the destruction of significant historical objects which cannot be replaced.

**24 Bakers Piece, Witney**  
**Lowlands Committee 15 August 2016**

This is a good example of an applicant listening to neighbour and officer concerns and making appropriate amendments to a scheme. The original proposal for a block of 4 flats was withdrawn to enable the original concerns to be addressed, and the current proposal has been amended by adding 3 parking spaces to address local concerns.

Para. 5.8 of the Officer report says that the proposed properties *"would form a logical compliment to the pattern of development in the area and the plot would be of a size which can comfortably accommodate the 3 new dwellings."*

Para. 5.11 says that the development *"would form a visually appropriate addition to the pattern of development in the area and the introduction of the new housing would not have an unacceptable impact on the street scene or the wider Conservation Area."*

Paragraphs 5.21 - 5.23 explain why the development would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties.

The scheme is small-scale and policy compliant, and the major local concern regarding parking provision has been addressed.

Makes good use of a left-over piece of land in a sustainable location - providing 3 small new homes.

County Highways - on objections

Conservation Officer - no objections